REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under

U.S. Patent No. 5,970,503 of Eisenberg (Eisenberg)

No claims have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being

unpatentable over Eisenberg. The Examiner has stated that

> As per claims 1, 5, and 9 Eisenberg teaches a method of updating a
> message from a first version to an upgraded version by chaining through
> intermediate versions as claimed, comprises receiving an update message
> having a first version format (thus, when an existing field is modified this
> generates a new filed closely linked to the first on previous records, but
> with a new version, which is readable as receiving an update message
> having a first version format) (see col. 2, lines 23-25). But, Eisenberg does
> not explicitly show the step of repeatedly generating a revised update
> message having a next most recent version format based on the update
> message until a final update message having an upgraded version format
> is generated. However, implicitly details step of from time to time in such
> a system it is necessary to revise the internal definitions that are used for
> the field, each time the internal definitions of data fields are changed this
> result in a new version of the database, if the change was made to
> information relating previous activities to the previous version
> information, then the change was applied to the database causing a new
> modified version of the database to exist, which is readable as repeatedly
> generating a revised update message having a next most recent version
> format based on the update message until a final update message having
> an upgraded version format is generated (see col. 1, lines 17-29). It would
> have been obvious to a person of ordinary in the art at time the
> Applicant's invention was made to have modified the teachings of
> Eisenberg with the step of repeatedly generating a revised update
> message having a most recent version format based on the update
> message until a final update message having an upgraded version format
> is generated, because such modification would allow the teachings of
> Eisenberg to provide list control which is able to identify the correlation of
> item usage with the entire list itself, and reconstructed through the
> correlation of different versions of elements of the database along with the
> effectivity control information (see col. 2, lines 8-14).

(p. 2-3 Office Action 3/08/01).

Applicants respectfully submit, however that claims 1-12 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 by Eisenberg. Claims 1-12 include the limitations

receiving an update message having a first version format;
(Claim 1) (emphasis added).

receipt of an update message having a first version format;
(Claim 5) (emphasis added).

means for receiving an update message having a first version format;
(Claim 9) (emphasis added).

In contrast, Eisenberg does not receive an update message having a first version format. In the citation referenced by the Examiner, Eisenberg discloses that

> In accordance with the invention, when an existing field is modified, this generates a new field closely linked to the first on previous records, but with a new version.

(Eisenberg Col. 2, lines 23-25).

Eisenberg further discloses that

> These and other features of the present invention are achieved in accordance with the present invention by the method according to the present invention comprising storing field definitions to define a version of a database, storing an effectivity table including a descriptor for each version (corresponding to a consistent set of fields) or field definition and the effective date therefor, storing records with data for the fields along with a date when the record was created, changing the version of the database, thereafter storing only revised field definitions and updating the stored effectivity table only with changes in a state of field definitions and version changes and an effectivity date therefor.

(Eisenberg Col. 2, lines 41-52).

In other words, Eisenberg stores changes made to a database and changes made to state of field definitions of the database in an effectivity table. Eisenberg makes no reference to an update message. In contrast, claims 1, 5, and 9 refer to receiving an update message having a first version format. Additionally, the applicants respectfully submit that Eisenberg does not explicitly or implicitly disclose repeatedly generating a revised update message having a next most recent version format based on the update message until a final update message having an upgraded version format is generated.

Given that claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 depend from claims 1, 5, and 9, applicants submit that claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 by the reference cited by the Examiner, for at least these reasons. Therefore, claims 1-12 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 by the references cited by the Examiner, for at least these reasons.

Applicants therefore submit that the rejections and objections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Stephen Neal at (408) 720-8300.

If any fee is due not covered by any check submitted please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: June 8, 2001

Stephen T. Neal
Reg. No. 47,815

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

81862.P122   7